DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 676 FL 025 477

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Johnson, Francis; Delarche, Marion; Marshall, Nicholas; Wurr, Adrian; Edwards, Jeffrey |
| TITLE | Changing Teacher Roles in the Foreign Language Classroom. |
| PUB DATE | 1998-00-00 |
| NOTE | 20p.; For complete volume of working papers, see FL 025 473. |
| PUB TYPE | Journal Articles (080) -- Opinion Papers (120) |
| JOURNAL CIT | Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education; v3 n2 p71-89 Spr 1998 |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Educational Needs; *Educational Trends; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Interpersonal Communication; *Language Teachers; Personal Autonomy; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Second Languages; *Student Role; Teacher Education; *Teacher Role; *Teacher Student Relationship; Trend Analysis |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Kanda University of International Studies (Japan) |

ABSTRACT

The roles of teachers in traditional second language classrooms are examined and measured against current conceptual trends within the discipline of foreign language learning and teaching. These trends, especially those in interpersonal communication and learner autonomy, require a new understanding of the classroom role of the language teacher. The Kanda English Language Proficiency (KELP) classroom at Kanda University (Japan) is then described; in this context, students assume responsibility for their own learning program. The teacher's role in this classroom is presented as an example of what the roles of foreign language teachers of the future might be. Implications for the future design of second language teacher training are also considered. (Contains 31 references.) (MSE)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 423 676

# *Changing Teacher Roles in the Foreign Language Classroom*

FRANCIS JOHNSON
MARION DELARCHE
NICHOLAS MARSHALL
ADRIAN WURR
JEFFREY EDWARDS

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

*This position paper examines the roles of teachers in traditional foreign language classrooms. It then measures these roles against current conceptual trends within the discipline of foreign language learning and teaching. In so doing, it argues that these trends, especially those in interpersonal communication and learner autonomy, require a new understanding of the roles of the foreign language teacher in the classroom. Next, it presents the KELP classroom of Kanda University in Japan—a classroom in which students assume responsibility for their own learning program—and the roles of the teacher in such an instructional system, as an illustrative example of what the roles of foreign language teachers of the future might be. Finally, implications for the future design of foreign language teacher-training courses are discussed.*

## INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, the TESOL classroom has been one which places undue emphasis on the teacher. According to Wright (1987), the characteristics of this tradition are that teachers are all-powerful and all-knowing, setting high standards and exercising tight control over the dissemination of learning and knowledge. Learners must conform to these standards, and their efforts are judged by their results in examinations. This teacher role is usually contrasted with the "interpretation" teacher (see section on Traditional Roles of the Teacher) who dispenses control and responsibility for learning more among the learners. These two teacher roles are posited against each other, but in reality they are two ends of the same continuum.

Our paper, which is based in part on research currently being carried out in the English Language Institute of Kanda University, examines these trends in foreign language teachers' roles in order to discern future directions in the profession. We begin our examination by reviewing past and present teacher roles. We then discuss these in relation to contemporary language learning theories. Next, we move to an extended description and discussion of the Kanda English Language Proficiency (KELP) classroom at Kanda University in which students assume responsibility for their own learning program. We examine the KELP classroom as a plausible design for future foreign language classrooms and discuss the roles of the teacher in such an instructional system. We argue that the trend towards greater learner autónomy

in classroom necessitates the adoption of new teacher roles for the foreign language classroom in unison with other curricular changes.

## TRADITIONAL CLASSROOM ROLES

This section gives the literature sources of evidence and information for traditional classroom roles.

### Language-Proficiency Course Books

Examination of popular course books, including but not limited to, students' books, teachers' books, audio tapes, and sometimes resource/practice books for supplementary grammatical practice, reveals that learners are given little or no choice *within* the course book to organize their learning. While units or sections may be omitted, the students' pathway through the course is relatively inflexible. In addition, learners are rarely encouraged to evaluate their learning through specific exercises. Textbooks, then, along with teacher-training courses, reflect the expectation that the whole class will react to the same (or at least related) text as input under the teacher's supervision.

A fitting example of such a paradigm is the *East-West* series (American English) published by Oxford University Press. In their introduction to Book One of this popular series, authors Graves and Rein (1988) assert that they identified the linguistic features students would need most in order to communicate effectively, and they based their text on these elements. The authors acknowledge that "Students become motivated when they are interested and engaged in what they're learning" (p. ix) and then proceed to explain how *they* decided what students should be interested in. Also seen as a positive feature is the fact that the book is organized such that "Each unit is carefully designed to build on the previous one." This statement makes clear that students are meant to progress through the book from the beginning to the end in a linear fashion, with no deviation from the predetermined path. The teacher's manual also identifies which exercises are "optional" or "alternative," again suggesting curricular decisions rest with the individual teacher. That is, students have no say as to which exercises will or will not be completed, and in what order.

That language instruction should be conducted in this way is in direct opposition to what Second Language Acquisition research tells us about individual differences and the impact that such differences have on language acquisition. Issues ranging from age at first L2 exposure, to aptitude, cognitive factors like learning style and field dependence/independence, affective factors like motivation and attitude, as well as risk-taking and use of learning strategies, have been discussed in the literature. Research into these issues has consistently shown that they are not to be taken lightly that a complex interrelation of all these factors results in each individual learner having a different way as well as rate of acquiring language (Ellis, 1994; Long & Larsen-Freeman, 1991). Despite such findings, most authors and publishers in the field,

while admitting to the reality of individual differences, continue to create course books that ignore such important differences. This may be sensible from a marketing point of view but is pedagogically unsound.

**Teacher-Training Textbooks**

There has been an explosion in the number of authoritative titles about teacher training in recent years, and it is difficult to narrow these down to a selective list. One very popular title is *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (Richards and Rodgers, 1986), which has a clear section on teacher roles within each approach or method analyzed. Jeremy Harmer's *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (1987) has been a favorite of British-based Royal Society of Arts Certificate and Diploma courses in foreign language teaching throughout the '80s and '90s. This provides a comprehensive and general overview. In a similar tradition to Harmer, Donn Byrne's (1986) *Teaching Oral English* and Matthews, Spratt & Dangerfield's (1985) *At the Chalkface—Practical Techniques in Language Teaching* are still quite popular. More recent teacher-training books, such as Omaggio's (1993) *Teaching Language in Context*, mention teacher roles and learner autonomy, but still default to the view of *learners as a group*, thus relegating any curriculum negotiation to a discussion of what is best for all.

Byrne (1986) describes three basic teacher roles in the oral English classroom. These are "presentation," when the teacher introduces something new to be learned; "practice," when the teacher allows the learners to work under his/her direction; and "production," when the teacher gives the students opportunities to work on their own (p. 2).

This broad division of the oral class into these stages with the teacher as a conductor has been paradigmatic in British teacher-training courses for some time now. While the classroom in these cases is no longer simply an institutionalized location for the transmission of a foreign language system, the teacher retains tight responsibility for planning material, and for pacing and controlling student activities. In this aspect, the teacher's role has not changed much from the grammar translation class.

The above mentioned texts all describe roles and activities in the lock-step classroom, which Dickinson (1987) defines as one in which all students are more or less engaged in studying the same thing at the same time. In such a classroom, students might be all listening to the same audio cassette, watching the same video, or working on the same tasks in the same textbook. As Johnson et al. (1995) has argued, research findings from studies on Second Language Acquisition and on learner differences do not necessarily validate such an approach. Interestingly, Breen (1985) views the classroom as a cultural setting where social realities "specify and mold the activities of teaching and learning" (p. 142). He concludes the classroom cultural setting is generally highly normative and inherently conservative. We feel that the conservative framework of most

educational establishments has institutionalized the lock-step classroom as their modus operandi. In other words, political and institutional considerations subsume pedagogical concerns so that alternative ways of teaching and learning are not addressed. The overall role of the teacher remains the planner and director of orchestrated lock-step learning.

**Teacher-Training Syllabi**

Teacher-training courses tend to be oriented towards particular methods and, therefore, instruct people to teach within the confines of those methods. Most of the methods promoted by these teacher-training courses place the teacher at the center of the class as described earlier. An extreme case of this is the grammar translation method, which is a true transmission classroom and places few demands on the teacher. Audio-lingualism is also a teacher-dominated method, and the teacher's role is central and active. According to this method, language learning results from active verbal interaction between teacher and learners.

The 1970s gave rise to a variety of methods in the generally held belief that there must be an optimum way to stimulate learners' acquisition and cognition of language. A number of methods attained brief notoriety until the broad-based approach, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), won general acceptance in English teaching circles. This approach sees communicative competence as the goal of language teaching and proposes procedures for such teaching based on the interdependence of language and communication. Minimally, students are expected to interact with other people; fluency and acceptable language are the primary goals. Generally speaking, several roles are assumed for teachers in CLT, a central one being to facilitate interaction. Richards and Rodgers (1986) hold that other roles include "needs analyst," "counselor," and "group-process manager" (p. 77).

The 1994-1995 RSA / Cambridge Diploma teacher-training schedule in Tokyo reflects the roles mentioned within the description of CLT above. Theoretical components of the course include "the learner and learning styles" and "learner strategies and the good language learner," but overall the teacher is assumed to be responsible, to a great extent, for the learners' motivation. This necessarily follows, since "intrinsic motivation will spring from an interest in what is being communicated by the language" (Finocchiaro and Brumfit, 1983, p. 91) and teachers are responsible for materials and tasks in the classroom. However, decision-making and control over what is studied has evolved more towards the learner recently, though we believe not enough (see section on Learner-centeredness).

**Statements of Professional Qualifications**

The Directory of Professional Preparation Programs in TESOL in the United States (Kornblum & Garshick, 1992) also specifies several roles for the English as a second language (ESL) teacher. As the largest organization of language-

teaching professionals in the world, TESOL has become the major organ for the legitimization of means as well as ends of English instruction. With the overall goal being the "mastery of communicative competence" (p. 231) by the students, the teacher's role is seen first as that of an evaluator who is responsible for judging how well students are moving toward this goal and where their strengths and weaknesses may lie. Following this evaluation, it is incumbent on the teacher to set objectives on behalf of the students, and to choose or modify approaches, methods and techniques as well as materials that will best encourage progress towards achieving those teacher-set objectives.

## TRADITIONAL ROLE OF THE TEACHER

### Model of Language

In classrooms where language teaching is understood as the transmission of a linguistic system, native-like proficiency is the desired paradigm. In this transmission setting, the teacher provides the model to which students aspire, usually in terms of knowledge of syntax and lexis, and possibly accurate pronunciation. Correct form and accuracy are more important than the content of messages, and students often compare their performance against that of the teacher.

### Lesson Planner and Director

The content of courses is usually decided by some higher authority than teachers. Decisions may be made at the department level, or at the school or college level. However, the planned events and classroom text to be used are generally decided by teachers. In this capacity it is the teacher's role to prepare materials that are stimulating for the students or to amend/revise published materials which are inappropriate. Byrne (1986, p. 3) sees this as part of the teacher's role as *motivator*. He sees students' motivation as a response to the interest intrinsic to the materials, rather than as an attitude that the students bring to the class. Legutke and Thomas (1991) would take issue with this view. They write that "the assumption that a well-selected and interesting topic would solve motivational problems and increase a willingness to learn (is) possibly short-sighted" (p. 24). We will take up this point more fully in later discussions on Learner Autonomy.

During the last few decades of language teaching, it has become more usual for teachers to engage in negotiation of the syllabus with students, especially in those classes following a notional-functional syllabus (Omaggio, 1993). This, however still does not account for learner differences—it involves mass negotiation of content only, so that while student input is sought on which notions or functions to include in the syllabus, all learners still must study that negotiated content through the methods, approaches, and techniques chosen by the teacher, and they must progress through tasks and exercises as a unified group. More often, it is the teacher who decides what and how the students will learn.

Nunan (1988) has advocated planning and needs analysis as a teacher role, pointing out in his *Learner-Centred Curriculum* that if needs analysis shows learners not seeing the importance of communicative activities, then "Somehow or other, the teacher. . .needs to convince learners of the value of communicative activities" (p. 96). Again, it is clear that the issue is not so much to pay attention to the needs that students express, but to impose upon learners the idea that the teacher knows best.

**Presenter of New Language Material**

The stage of a lesson where learners focus their attention on text, prior to performing an associated task, is often termed input. In this case the teacher assumes responsibility for introducing the language. This is one of the three paradigmatic stages of oral classes mentioned earlier. The teacher should be sensitive as to what and how much information to give and should also consider appropriateness of level. According to Byrne (1986, p. 2), the teacher is the center of activity at this point.

In connection with this stage, Cranmer (in Matthews, Spratt and Dangerfield, 1985) sees the motivation arising from the teacher's qualities as crucial to learners' performance, and discusses "sensitivity, sympathy, flexibility . . . avoidance of sarcasm and ridicule . . . appropriate personality role (paternal, maternal, fraternal)." Where he places responsibility on the teacher, in this respect we would provide learners with genuine choices (see discussions later on The KELP Conceptual Framework) about what and how to study and hence give space for motivation from the learner's perspective.

**Controller/Monitor of Student Practice—Checking and Correcting**

At this stage of the lesson the teacher's role becomes less central as the students practice the language and the teacher observes, noting student errors and judging when to change activities. Byrne (1986) likens the teacher's role to that of the conductor of an orchestra, "giving each of the performers a chance to participate and monitoring their performance" (p. 2). Implicit in this role is the issue of how much, what, when and how to correct student errors. Harmer (1987) discusses five techniques for indicating that students have made an error. The intention is that if students understand this feedback they will be able to correct the mistake and this self-correction will be helpful as part of their overall learning process. Any division of roles is always arbitrary to some extent but in the case of oral practice, we can suggest that a further stage develops from this one, where the teacher is manager and guide for students' production of language.

**Assessor of Student Knowledge and Performance**

As already stated above, the role of assessor is one specified by the Directory of Professional Preparation Programs in TESOL: it is by being the assessor of performance that the teacher checks his or her effectiveness in propelling students towards communicative compe-

tence. McArthur (1983), in his discussion of the place of formal testing in the language classroom, points out that in more informal types assessment (such as continued observation of individual students' progress) it is assumed that it is teachers who "know the students best and are in the best of all possible positions to evaluate each individual" (p. 110).

**Classroom Manager**

Several of the roles described thus far can be considered managerial. Wright (1987) defines management as "teaching or learning behavior aimed at organizing learning and learning activities" (p. 157). In common with Byrne, as aforementioned (in the section on Lesson Planner and Director), Wright further deems "motivation" a key management role and lists several sub-components (p. 53) of this: projecting a positive attitude to learners, providing interesting tasks, maintaining discipline, arranging and adjusting group configurations, providing self-appraisal opportunities, etc.

Wright (1987) contrasts the management behavior of "transmission" and "interpretation" teachers (p. 63) in several ways. A transmission teacher maintains a high degree of control over learners while the interpretation teacher maintains control by persuasion. The interpretation teacher disperses responsibility for learning among the learners. In relative terms, the management of Wright's interpretation teacher is much more learner-centered than that of his transmission teacher. We argue in the next section that it does not go far enough.

## CONTEMPORARY CHANGES IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

**Learner-Centeredness**

As opposed to the traditional classroom, the concept of learner-centeredness advocates the use of student input and feedback in the structuring and ongoing modification of the curriculum. This concept of learner-centeredness is not, as Nunan (1995) recently pointed out, an "all-or-nothing concept," (p. 134) but rather a relative one. Nunan defines a learner-centered curriculum as one which "will contain similar components to those contained in traditional curricula. However, the key difference is that in a learner-centred curriculum, key decisions . . . be made with reference to the learner" (p. 134). Nunan (1988) originally saw learner-centeredness in terms of negotiation with and input from learners, but more recently has enlarged his definition to include full learner autonomy at the "strong" end of the pedagogical continuum (Nunan, 1995). This accords well with our view of learner-centeredness, which maintains the learner as an individual capable of designing his or her own program of study, not as one who simply adds an opinion to a majority rule decision on syllabus or class content.

Accepting such a view of learner-centeredness demands many changes in the classroom. Most course books with their steady lock-step progression of chapters do not fit into our structure since they

do not allow for individually-charted courses through curricula. In classes centered around conventional course books of today, students and teachers may work together to renegotiate the curriculum so that it better matches the students' needs and learning styles. Yet, if they are locked into using textbooks which are not flexible, individual strategic and cognitive preferences and styles are not being addressed. We would argue that materials should be created to be used in such a way that learners have some choice in all aspects: activities and pathways through them, as well as when they will be working, and with whom.

Both the *Options* series (Harrison & Mont, 1995), created for and now in use at Tokyo's Kanda Institute of Foreign Languages, and the *Tapestry* series (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992) show features of learner choice as described above, and are forerunners in the conceptual design that we advocate in this paper.

**Interpersonal Communication**

Mass-marketed materials have often reflected a view of language as a set of symbols that must be successfully manipulated in order for communication to occur. This may be partially due to the huge influence of Chomsky's (1965) notion of language as an abstract representation of language as form. This notion is far removed from the concept of communicative language teaching, in which we have now come to recognize the interpersonal nature of language. The idea that language is inseparable from its larger context is by no means a new one: Malinowski (1935) maintained that the linguistic utterance is defined within its context of situation and culture. From this developed the principles of communicative language teaching within the tradition of British linguistics. However, it is only with general acceptance of the communicative approach that language as the exchange and creation of meaning in a communicative context has finally gained ascendancy in language teaching.

As the classroom changes, it is in part responding to the overdue acceptance of this view of language. In the past, language was seen for pedagogical purposes as something the teacher transmitted to the learner by presenting new material and modeling its use. The formal aspects of language were attended to in this type of language teaching, but little or no attention was paid to the strategic, discourse, or communicative aspects of language (Canale & Swain, 1980).

If all aspects of language competence are to be addressed, the type of classroom exercises must necessarily include more communicative activities such as those that mirror real-world exchanges or that stress formal aspects of language. Lessons should involve students being able not only to perform drills, but also to work together on tasks in which they need language to reach some mutually determined goal. In our view, the materials must reflect the complementary aspects of language creation by including task-based activities such as problem-solving, which involve the manipulation of information to some end, and text-based activities, where

the intended end products are samples of accurate language (Johnson et al., 1995). As Nunan (1988) states—

> . . . a basic principle underlying all communicative approaches is that learners must learn not only to make grammatically correct, propositional statements about the experiential world, but must also develop the ability to use language to get things done . . . simply being able to create grammatically correct structures in language did not necessarily enable the learner to use the language to carry out various real-world tasks. [p. 25]

Incumbent on the paradigm shift to meaningful and contextually-based communication is the development of interpersonal communication. Richards and Rodgers (1986) note that a primary purpose of language is to serve "as a vehicle for the realization of interpersonal relations" (p. 17). Language is seen as the tool used to describe and interpret experience. Yet one's view of the experience is never absolute but rather subject to modification through a process of negotiation with others (Kelly, 1955). Language then is not merely transactional discourse, rather it creates meaning as input and output through social interactions. In an educational setting, this negotiated creation of meaning may occur between students; students and the teacher; or the teacher, students, and the community.

**Learner Autonomy**

What began with an increased awareness of the importance of learner input in creating a curriculum and materials has now evolved to enable learners to have a greater say in every aspect of their learning. There is a current trend towards increased autonomy for learners. This not only entails the student conferring with the teacher in order to allow the teacher to make more informed decisions about the directions the programs and materials should take, but should also allow the students to design their own programs of study as the managers and directors of their own learning. Nunan (1995), in finally recognizing the later and stronger view of learner autonomy, has recently advocated "the development of curricula and materials which encourage learners to move towards the fully autonomous end of the pedagogical continuum" (p. 134).

In an experiment described by Entwhistle (as cited in Dickinson, 1987) it was shown that outcomes of language learning are more successful if types of materials are matched with preferred learning style. We would like to extend the ramifications of Entwhistle's findings. If students choose materials and pathways through them, rather than having them prescribed by the teacher, learning outcomes may well become more satisfactory. This then embraces the stronger version of learner autonomy that language teaching is currently turning towards.

When students are compelled to assume greater responsibility for directions their learning will take, they will gradually learn to see themselves as the controllers of their own learning—learning is seen as something which is self-initiated and not other-initiated. The final outcome of this type of system is to encourage life-long learning as an intrinsically rewarding experience and therefore as something which can continue outside of formal instruction and out of the presence of the teacher, whether that be at the end of the class, or at the end of the course (Holec, 1980 and 1987; Dickenson, 1987). This, according to Knowles (1975), is our duty as educators: to make learners understand that learning can be achieved in this way, and then provide them with the training to do so.

The teacher roles implicit in the above may be difficult for some to accept given their professional training and their perception of themselves as the classroom "experts." In fact, this style of classroom does not in any way impinge on the teacher's expertise—rather, it is the focus of that expertise that changes. Whereas now, the teacher is used as presenter of language elements and as lesson planner, autonomy shifts the teacher more into the role of counselor. In Wright's (1987) terms, there is a greater shift away from the "transmission" paradigm towards the "interpretation" end of the continuum. The teacher then becomes the one who—because of in-depth knowledge of and experience with how learning occurs and can be facilitated—can suggest to learners ways to go about learning and can counsel them in methods of solving learning problems.

The teacher also has an important role as the one who must train students in how to become autonomous, since students come to learning often unaware of how to take an active role (Allwright, 1981). In the roles of trainer and counselor, the teacher may at times need to sit back and allow the students to make choices which seem to be unbeneficial in order to allow them, possibly through "failure" in a learning activity, to learn how to really manage their own learning and make their own decisions (Sturtridge, 1992). In this way, Cornwall (1988) has found that learners, upon being asked to plan and direct their own programs of study, find the thought and energy this requires and come to have an increased respect for the expertise of the teacher.

As Kohonen (1989) points out, this greater student autonomy requires the teacher to have "a basic trust in the learner's will and ability to cope with these tasks, and a respect for his person and his choices" (p. 12). Wright (1987) adds that this has beneficial effects in the interpersonal communication between teachers and learners as it entails a basic change in teacher and student roles (see section on Teacher Roles in the KELP Classroom) as the perceived power or position of the co-conversationalists shifts from a hierarchical relationship to one of relative equality.

**A Predictive View of the Future Foreign Language Classroom**

Discussions of learner autonomy until now have usually pointed to the need for student-centered activities and negotiated curricula to ensure that tasks are meaningful for the students (Nunan, 1988), yet often student input has been limited to group decisions. Students have been discussed only in the *plural*; rarely have allowances been made for individual likes and dislikes. Recall for example the notional-functional syllabus in which (as mentioned in section on Lesson Planner and Director) students are included in syllabus design, but only as a class, not as individuals with unique needs.

As we move along the continuum of learner-centeredness, we should expect to see an increase in strong-end learner-centeredness and in the behavioral autonomy of the learner. The individual needs, wants, and desires of each student within the classroom will eventually be fully recognized and allowed for within a maximally learner-centered educational system. Learners and not instructors will increasingly be the ones who decide what they will study, and learners, not instructors, will increasingly define for themselves *why* they are studying as they set their own goals and objectives.

Additionally, learning may not be confined to the traditional four-walled classroom. The interactional component of modern language teaching will continue to emphasize the performance of social interactions not only with the teacher and peers but also in the community. These changes are consistent with the belief that students should acquire the needed skills to design and manage their own learning, to evaluate their own progress and continue to learn even outside a formal institution. As such, these changes should be welcomed rather than feared by educators.

## THE KELP PROJECT AS AN EXAMPLE

**Introduction**

The foregoing discussion of the traditional roles of the teacher in the foreign language classroom and the contemporary changes in thinking about foreign language learning constitute the rationale for the KELP (Kanda English Language Proficiency ) research project to which we will now turn our attention. We use the KELP project as a predictive example of one way in which the strong-version of learner autonomy which we here advocate can be realized.

The KELP Project, although based on theoretical and implementational principles discussed in the section below on The KELP Conceptual Framework, is firmly focused on the English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom and the way a student operates in such a classroom. The research imperative is stated ultimately as a question: Can we devise a classroom instructional system in which the students plan and carry out their own individually-designed courses?

We are not interested in promoting any one approach or method or textbook course of foreign language learning and teach-

ing, for we believe that the differences between learners prevent specification of any one best way of learning for individuals. We see all approaches and the detailed instructional materials on which they are based as potential candidates for choice by students who best know what and how they wish to study. Our concern is the creation of a classroom instructional system which accommodates the different interests and preferences found in any group of learners.

**The KELP Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework of the KELP Project comprises both theoretical and implementational principles which govern learning and instruction in the classroom. These principles are discussed next.

Theoretical principles are concerned with the establishment of a classroom instructional system which is both individualized and communicative. By "individualized" we mean a system within which each student plans and carries out a personalized course based on a set of course requirements—designed to ensure exposure to a variety of types of content and learning—and instructional materials chosen by the student on the basis of that student's interests and preferences. By "communicative" we mean the need for a high density of interpersonal interaction in the classroom as students progress through their courses.

Implementational principles focus on the roles that learners, teachers, instructional materials, and the classroom itself—the "factors of production" of learning—play in facilitating the completion of personalized courses. Learner roles describe the student as planner, director, and assessor of learning. Teacher roles, to be described in greater detail later, highlight the teacher's function as a facilitator of learning. Instructional materials are viewed as a bank of selectable resources, while the classroom is seen as an environment responsive to the immediate and changing needs, preferences and interests of students.

**The KELP Classroom**

The KELP classroom, as a physical entity, is a room which is divided into "learning centers" in which students complete different activities. Classroom layout is designed to accommodate individual, pair and small group, and whole-class activities. What distinguishes these activities from their counterparts in traditional classrooms is that here the students decide when to initiate an activity, *not* the teacher.

The KELP classroom, as a group of learners, operates through a learner contract worked out by each student in consultation with the classroom teacher at the beginning of the course. Contracts are expressed as a notional number of hours spent completing designated activities. Course requirements entail time on task and types (individual, pair, small group, etc.) of learning activities.

In many ways, the KELP classroom resembles the self-access or independent learning centers found in many language-learning institutions. However, whereas

such centers are essentially adjuncts to the core classroom learning program, the KELP classroom *is* the core program.

**Teacher Roles in the KELP Classroom**

Because this paper focuses on the changing roles of the teacher and the teacher-training implications of these changing roles, we will now examine in some detail the roles of the KELP classroom teacher. These roles contribute in several ways to the overall role of the teacher as *facilitator* of learning. It is the teacher's task to make sure that students are able to carry out their personalized courses in an efficient and satisfying way. To do this we can identify the following teacher roles:

***Manager of the classroom instructional systems.*** The teacher is quintessentially a manager ensuring that the factors of production operate efficiently. As classroom manager the KELP teacher is responsible for the following:

1. Setting up the classroom. In this role the teacher arranges the furniture and instructional materials to make sure that students can easily access and use needed materials.

2. Training students to make course plans and consulting with them on the preparation of their learner contracts. In the KELP instructional system, the teacher must approve each learner contract to check that all course requirements have been met. Such consultation not only ensures exposure to a variety of types of content and learning, but also helps orient students to a system of learning that may initially appear strange to them.

3. Managing learner assessment. Consequent to a movement away from summative and teacher-directed assessment towards formative, criterion-referenced assessment, the teacher's role in assessing student performance is changing. In the KELP classroom, the student is responsible for recording progress through the course. In some parts of the course, and in some activities, the teacher will be involved in the assessment process. However, as manager, the teacher is responsible for checking that students record progress accurately and maintain their profiles of work completed.

4. Maintaining discipline. As disciplinarian the KELP teacher is responsible for ensuring that the classroom provide a quiet and congenial atmosphere in which to work. The teacher is also responsible for ensuring that students comply with any regulations imposed by the institution, such as attendance.

***Counselor of learners and consultant of learning.*** The role of the teacher as manager concerns mainly the relationship between the teacher and the class as a whole. To each student in the class, the teacher is a counselor and a consultant who is available to give advice about the

student's course. This means that the teacher must be available to be able to give such counsel to individuals; thus, the teacher must be freed from the need to be continually presenting new language material and monitoring student practice of that material. Presentation and practice functions in the language classroom can be assumed by instructional materials which, if they have been carefully designed to exploit the variety of media currently available, can replace a teacher so that the teacher is available to perform classroom tasks which instructional materials cannot perform—those tasks which involve giving professional advice to students.

The role of counselor and consultant will include, among other tasks, giving advice about what to do when a student or group of students have trouble completing an activity. To be able to give such advice, the professional teacher must know well the instructional materials and the students who are using those materials. In short, the teacher must be a scholar of learning and learners.

***Scholar of learning and learners.*** In order to counsel students, to guide them towards making sound choices about their courses, the teacher must come to "know" a student very well. As already noted, the plethora of individual differences exhibited by learners in a classroom, differences which lead them to choose different paths in a course, are well documented in the literature of language learning and teaching. Such differences only become apparent in the operation of the course, as they cannot be predicted before the course begins. The teacher has to study learners in operation to learn as much as possible about their unique patterns of learning.

As a scholar of learning, the teacher will be involved with what is sometimes called "reflective teaching" or "action research," which will be referred to again later. Such activity can be carried out at many different levels of complexity—from relatively superficial observations of classroom behavior to the carefully structured data-based research carried out at some universities.

The degree of sophistication of this research does not necessarily reflect its contribution to the improvement of classroom learning. What is important is that the teacher reflects upon teaching and learning, and applies the insights gleaned to counseling students. What this means is that professional teaching has a built-in scholarly process of data collection, scrutiny and evaluation of data, and use of the results of such a process as one of the teacher's roles in the classroom.

***Instructor and assessor.*** There are many "teachers" in every classroom: A textbook can teach students; a video machine can often present new language material in context more effectively than a human teacher can. A student can teach or tutor fellow students, often very effectively; a tape recorder, television set, or radio can "teach," each medium having built-in advantages for the teaching of certain

kinds of information. So, too, can the professional teacher teach.

All of the teachers mentioned above can carry out classroom instruction—*i.e.* they can present new information to students and provide practice and feedback on that practice to students. Sometimes the professional teacher instructs students. This desirably happens when other "teachers" cannot be used, for the professional teacher can do many things that other less qualified "teachers" cannot do: a tape recorder cannot be a scholar of learning; A video cannot counsel students when they have learning problems.

Desirably, in an individualized and communicative instructional system, the professional teacher will have available a variety of teaching resources so that instructional work is kept to a minimum and he or she can concentrate on *managing, counseling,* and *studying* learners and learning to make improvements in the instructional system.

It is recognized, however, that in institutions where such technology is not already available, the set-up costs associated with instructional systems like the KELP classroom can be formidable. Yet the ever increasing availability and use of multimedia in the global marketplace have made TVs, video cameras, computers and the like standard fare in many educational settings. Given this, the question is not so much *should* the technology be used, but *how* to use it most effectively and efficiently.

In the KELP classroom, much of the assessment of learner work will be done by the learners. The management aspects of learner assessment have already been mentioned. However, it must be recognized that the professional teacher will be involved in both formative and summative assessment to the extent necessary to ensure satisfactory work and progress in the KELP classroom.

**Future Implications for Teacher Training.**

This paper has used the KELP classroom as a model which, we believe, foreshadows potential foreign language learning classrooms of the future. We have attempted to provide evidence that this model is consonant with the findings of contemporary research into foreign language learning and teaching, and is a reasonable basis from which to make predictions about what the future roles of foreign language classroom teachers might be. However, our concern to date has been with the design and implementation of the KELP project; conclusive assessment of its results is the next stage of the project.

The next section of our paper argues the implications of our research for the foreign language teachers of the future. Such implications are presented in two parts. First, the traditional roles of the foreign language teacher, outlined in the section above on Traditional Classroom Roles, will be compared and contrasted with those of the teacher in the KELP classroom. Such an analysis will serve as a rationale for proposed changes in emphasis in teacher-training programs. Second, some parameters of a future

teacher-training course will be proposed and discussed.

**The Rationale for Change—Traditional vs. Future Classroom Roles of the Foreign Language Teacher**

Earlier on we outlined the traditional (present) classroom roles of foreign language teachers. It is, we submit, fruitful to compare and contrast these roles with the roles of the KELP teacher described section above on Teacher Roles in the KELP Classroom. We believe that such a comparison serves as a rationale for a change in the curricula for the training of foreign language teachers.

***Model of language.*** Such a prime role for the teacher assumes a classroom in which the teacher is the source of foreign language input. In this technological age such an assumption is neither valid nor appropriate. The classroom teacher cannot model the variety of modalities necessary to provide a communicative (focusing on use) rather than a linguistic (focusing on usage) basis for foreign language learning. Moreover, such a role could imply that native speakers of the target language are inherently "better" teachers of that language than are other teachers.

***Lesson planner and director.*** This view of the teacher as the omnipresent provider of knowledge to students assumes student sameness and lock-step progression of the class through a course. The movement towards learner-centeredness and curriculum design based on student needs, interests and preferences had produced recognition of differences in students as a basis for success in learning. Such a movement precludes the use of a "one plan for all" approach to lesson planning.

***Presenter of new language material.*** The teacher can be a presenter of new language material, but questions are now being raised—especially with the advent of new technologies in the classroom, including interactive video, and the desirability of having different presentations at different times according to different course plans—about whether presenting new language is the most effective use of the professional teacher's time.

***Controller/monitor of student practice—Checking and correcting.*** The teacher of the future will continue to be a monitor of student practice, though not necessarily a controller of student practice. With the change of emphasis from the linguistic to the communicative aspects of the language-learning syllabus, practice activities which are self-checking or which have a non-linguistic check of communication are of increasing importance.

***Assessor of student knowledge and performance.*** The future foreign language teacher will, it is submitted, continue to have a crucial role in both formative and summative assessment of learners. However, in this continuing role, contemporary trends towards the increasing value placed on competency-based measures of achievement and the desir-

ability of student participation in self- and peer assessment point to the teacher's role as manager/counselor/consultant/assessor rather than as judge assessor.

***Classroom manager.*** As expressed earlier in this paper, the teacher as classroom manager is projected to be the primary role of the foreign language teacher of the future. However, it is the difference between the management roles outlined earlier and those in the KELP description which help define the rationale for change in the training of foreign language teachers. Such difference is essentially the change of teacher from controller to facilitator of classroom activity.

**Parameters of a Teacher-Training Course for Foreign Language Teachers of the Future**

If curricula for the training of foreign language teachers of the future are to change, what are the directions of those changes, and how are they desirably put into effect? A complete answer to these and other questions associated with the changing nature of the foreign language classroom is beyond the scope of this paper. However, as a conclusion, we wish to suggest certain topics which, in addition to those usually covered in teacher-training courses, need to be addressed by teacher trainers. The following are some suggested topics.

***Focus on classroom management skills.*** It is submitted that the single most important skill of the foreign language classroom teacher of the future will be skill in the management of a group of students as they plan and direct their own learning programs using a selectable bank of instructional materials. Such management skill will, as has been pointed out above, be multifaceted. It will, for example, involve the teacher in training students to make choices, or in setting up groups of students at different times. Such management skills will desirably be based on a sound knowledge of group dynamics.

***Training in student counseling.*** To be able to train students to assume responsibility for planning and carrying out their own learning programs, teachers need to become skilled counselors. They need to have studied how to lead students to accept responsibility for their own work and to request help when needed.

***Reflective teaching and action research.*** The teacher as scholar of learning and learners needs to know how to systematically observe and reflect on the system of instruction in the classroom and on the individual and group patterns of learning which that system produces.

***Communicative approaches to formative and summative assessment.*** An instructional system similar to the one which operates in the KELP classroom requires of the teacher professional training in new directions of learner assessment. Such training will include new developments in self- and peer assessment.

These implications for the training of the foreign language

teachers of the future are not intended to replace the present training syllabi but rather to complement and add to them. It is true that the teaching profession is changing towards higher professionalism on the part of the teacher. As new technologies for the presentation and exchange of information become more sophisticated and less expensive they are able to assume some of the para-professional roles of the classroom teacher, including the presentation of new material to students and the monitoring of the practice of that new material. As this happens, the teacher is freed to concentrate on those functions which technology cannot cope with—the making of decisions based on professional knowledge and human intuition.

## CONCLUSION

In this paper we have attempted to examine the roles of teachers in traditional (present) foreign language classrooms and measure these against current conceptual trends within the discipline of foreign language learning and teaching. We have argued that these trends, especially those in interpersonal communication and learner autonomy, require a new view of the roles of the foreign language teacher in the classroom. We have used the example of the KELP classroom and the roles of the KELP teacher as a predictive example of the foreign language teacher of the future. Drawing on our research and experience in the KELP classroom, we have briefly suggested some implications for the design of foreign language teacher-training courses in the future.

## REFERENCES

Allwright. R. (1981). What do we want teaching materials for? *English Language Teaching Journal 36,* 5-18.

Breen, M. (1985). The social context for language learning—a neglected situation? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition 7,* 135-58.

Byrne, D. (1986). *Teaching oral English.* Essex: Longman.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics 1,* 1-47.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Cornwall, M. (1988). Putting it into practice: Promoting independent learning in a traditional institution. In Boud, D. (Ed.). *Developing student autonomy in learning.* (pp. 242-57). London: Kogan.

Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in language learning.* Sydney: Cambridge University Press

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Tokyo: Oxford University Press.

Finocchiaro, M., & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The functional-notional approach: From theory to practice.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Graves, K., & Rein, D. (1988). *East-West 1 teacher's book.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Harmer, J. (1987). *The Practice of English language teaching.* Essex: Longman.

Harrison, I., & Mont, M. (Eds.). (1995). *Options*. Tokyo: Kanda Institute of Foreign Languages.

Holec, H. (1980). Learner training: Meeting needs in self-directed learning. In Altman & Vaughan James (Eds.) *Foreign language teaching: Meeting individual needs*. (pp. 30-45). Oxford: Pergamon.

_____. (1987). The learner as manager: Managing learning or managing to learn? In Wenden and Rubin (Eds.) *Learner strategies in language learning*, (pp. 145-158). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Johnson, F., Delarche, M., & Marshall, N. (1995). The learner as course planner/director. *The Journal of Kanda University of International Studies 7*, 1-44.

Kelly, G. (1955). *A theory of personality: The psychology of personal constructs*. New York: Norton & Co.

Knowles, M. (1975). *Self-directed learning: A guide for learners and teachers*. Chicago: Association Press.

Kohonen, V. (1989). Experiential language learning: Second language learning as learner education. Unpublished working paper of the Bilingual Research Group, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Kornblum, H., & Garshick, E. (Eds.) (1992). *Directory of professional preparation programs in TESOL in the United States*. Alexandria, Virginia: TESOL.

Legutke, M., & Thomas, H. (1991). *Process and experience in the language classroom*. New York: Longman.

Long, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. New York: Longman.

Malinowski, B. (1935). *Coral gardens and their magic*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Matthews, A., Spratt, M., & Dangerfield, L. (Eds.). (1985). *At the chalkface—practical techniques in language teaching*. Baltimore: Edward Arnold.

McArthur, T. (1983). *A foundation course for language teachers*. Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centred curriculum*. Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1995). Closing the gap between learning and instruction. *TESOL Quarterly 29* (1), 133-158.

Omaggio, A. (1993). *Teaching language in context*, (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Richards, J. & Rodgers, T. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

Scarcella, R., & Oxford, R. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Sturtridge, G. (1992). *Self-access: Preparation and training*. Manchester, England: The British Council.

Wright, T. (1987). *Roles for teachers and learners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.